



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,767	11/10/2003	Ricardo Perotto	930024-2055	4372

7590 03/06/2007  
Ronald R. Santucci  
Frommer Lawrence & Haug, LLP  
745 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER
----------

BUTLER, PATRICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,767

Applicant(s)

PEROTTO, RICARDO

Examiner

Patrick Butler

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20061204</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 04 December 2006, which is a re-submission of the IDS filed 22 March 2004, fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(b)(1), which requires the following: Each U.S. patent listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by inventor, patent number, and issue date. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Specifically, cited US Patent No. 3,548,081 issued 15 December 1970 to DeMarinis et al. It appears that the cited document is a typographical error.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to Claim 9, the term "polyester felt" is used. Felt is made of wool, however a felt-like material may be made of polyester (see Smith, *Textiles in Perspective*, pages 254, 255, and 418; Collier, *Understanding Textiles*, pages 358 and 359). However, neither wool felt nor a polyester felt-like material is claimed. Therefore, it is unclear whether wool, a polyester-wool blend, or polyester is the material. For

Art Unit: 1732

purposes of examination, the examiner interprets the phrase "polyester felt" to mean any non-woven material having some content of polyester.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 teaches the claimed process of making a connected sole and upper of a shoe (a method of manufacturing a part of a sports boot) by injection molding (in composite material) with the steps of molding a resting surface of a sole (preparing a first blank in a flexible material intended to form the external face

Art Unit: 1732

of the boot part) and an upper (a second flexible material intended to form the internal face of the boot part) and placing the sole and upper in a mold with the sole against an impression 8 (placing the first and second blanks on the impression of a first half of a mold with the first blank against the impression), and removing from the mold after curing of the injected material (see Fig. 7-12).

Regarding Claim 1, although Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 teaches injecting into the mold, Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 does not specifically teach closing the mold, using a foamable binding material, and removing the cured product from the mold.

However, it is submitted that it for the injected material to be contained, the mold would have been at least partially closed (closing the mold by using its second half). It is also submitted that the use of polyurethane as an injection molded material is well known (injecting a foamable binding material between the blanks). It is also submitted that for use of the product and reuse of the mold, it would need to be removed (mold release after polymerization of the injected material so as to obtain the boot part).

Regarding Claim 2, Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 teaches the part made comprises the upper. Therefore it is a part of the upper of the boot.

Regarding Claim 3, although Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 teaches making the sports boot part, Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 does not specifically teach that the sole is rubber.

However, it is submitted that the use of vulcanized rubber as a sole is well known (wherein the injected material is a polyurethane foam). The rubber is vulcanized, which

Art Unit: 1732

makes it synthetic. The sole is rubber, which is a polymer, and shaped as a film 4. Therefore, the sole is a polymer film and thus a fabric (see Smith, *Textiles in Perspective*, page 418).

Regarding Claim 4, as previously described, the sole is vulcanized rubber (elastic) and is fabric as described with respect to Claim 3.

Regarding Claim 10, although Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 teaches injecting into the mold, Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,017 does not specifically teach using polyurethane as the injected binding material.

However, it is submitted that the use of polyurethane as an injection molded material is well known (wherein the injected material is a polyurethane foam).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017).

With respect to Claim 1, Foffano teaches a method of making a connected sole and upper of a shoe (a method of manufacturing a part of a sports boot) by injection molding (in composite material) with the steps of molding a resting surface of a sole from rubber (preparing a first blank in a flexible material intended to form the external face of the boot part) and an upper (a second flexible material intended to form the

Art Unit: 1732

internal face of the boot part) and placing the sole and upper in a mold with the sole against an impression 8 (placing the first and second blanks on the impression of a first half of a mold with the first blank against the impression) (claims 1 and 5; col. 2, lines 64-66), closing the mold (See Fig. 3-4) (closing the mold by using its second half), injecting polyurethane between the two layers (injecting a foamable binding material between the blanks) (see col. 3, lines 32; claim 5), and removing from the mold after curing of the injected material (mold release after polymerization of the injected material so as to obtain the boot part) (see Fig. 7-12).

With respect to Claim 2, the part made comprises the upper 2; therefore it is a part of the upper of the boot (see Fig. 12; claims 1, 4, and 5).

With respect to Claim 5, the sole 4 is vulcanized rubber (an elastomer) (see col. 3, line 33).

With respect to Claim 10, Foffano teaches injecting polyurethane between the two layers (see col. 3, lines 32; claim 5).

With respect to Claim 22, Foffano teaches that the final shoe is obtained (the boot part has its final three-dimensional shape) once the last and shell are removed (upon release from the mold) (see col. 3, lines 35-38).

Claims 3 and 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as evidenced by Smith (*Textiles in Perspective*, page 418).

With respect to Claim 3, the sole 4 is vulcanized rubber (see col. 3, line 33). The rubber is vulcanized, which makes it synthetic. The sole is rubber, which is a polymer,

Art Unit: 1732

and shaped as a film 4. Therefore, the sole is a polymer film and thus a fabric (see Smith, *Textiles in Perspective*, page 418).

With respect to Claim 4, the sole 4 is vulcanized rubber (elastic) (see col. 3, line 33) and is fabric as described with respect to Claim 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Sassler (US Patent No. 4,187,623).

With respect to Claim 6, Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

Foffano does not expressly teach the thickness of the rubber sole.

Sassler teaches making a sports shoe with a rubber sole (first material) with a sole thickness of at the most 1.5 to 1.8 mm (see Sassler, col. 1, lines 34-39), which includes the claimed range of 0.8 - 1 mm (the first material has a thickness of from 0.8 to 1 mm).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sassler's sole thickness with Foffano's method of



Art Unit: 1732

making a shoe in order to craft an extremely lightweight athletic shoe (see Sassler, col. 1, lines 34-39).

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Huebner et al. (German Patent Document No. DE 19512499C1).

With respect to Claims 7 and 9, Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

Foffano does not expressly teach the thickness of the rubber sole.

Huebner teaches making a shoe with the upper containing polyester felt (synthetic fabric; polyester felt) at the toe (see abstract and title).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Huebner's polyester felt upper with Foffano's method of making a shoe for the toe cap to be able to retain its air trapping quality under compression at pressures arising during normal use (see Huebner, abstract).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Legassie et al. (US Patent No. 5,343,638).

With respect to Claim 8, Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

Foffano does not expressly teach that the second material comprises elastic fabric.

Legassie teaches using elastic fabric in the upper of a shoe (the second material comprises elastic fabric) (see col. 11, lines 38-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Legassie's elastic fabric with Foffano's method of making a shoe in order to have an upper that is extremely lightweight and supportively conforms to the contour of the wearer's foot (see Legassie col. 11, lines 35-41).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Brehmer et al. (US Patent No. 4,793,882).

With respect to Claims 11 and 12, Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

Foffano does not expressly teach that one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold.

Brehmer teaches screen-printing a part of a shoe upper (one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold) (see col. 1, lines 12-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine screen printing the shoe upper as taught by Brehmer with Foffano's method of making a shoe in order to stiffen the shoe upper (see Brehmer, col. 3, lines 12-14).

Claims 11, 13-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Perotto '130 (US Patent No. 4,428,130).

Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

With respect to Claims 11, 13, 14, and 17, Foffano does not expressly teach that one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold.

Perotto '130 teaches affixing an eyelet element to a constructed upper before the upper is assembled to form a shoe (one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold; wherein the affixed element is an eyelet for a lace) (see Fig. 1). The eyelet allows threading by hooks or a strap 10. Thus, the eyelet is a reinforcing member in that it provides a way to reinforce the wrapping integrity (a reinforcing element).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine attaching an eyelet 11 as taught by Perotto '130 with Foffano's method of making a shoe in order to have an eyelet to thread a tightening strip 10 through for the top of the item to be tightened (see Fig. 1).

With respect to Claim 14, the eyelet 11 is a ring. The ring could be used as a receiver for a hook. Therefore, it is a ring for gripping, as not step of gripping is positively claimed.

With respect to Claim 15, Foffano does not expressly teach that one of the materials has a watertight flap affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold.

Perotto '130 teaches a flap 20 that overlies a cutout of the upper. Compared to the cutout, the flap is watertight.

Art Unit: 1732

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine attaching a flap as taught by Perotto '130 with Foffano's method of making a shoe in order to have a flap to seal the cutout in the upper (see Fig. 1).

Claims 11, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foffano et al. (US Patent No. 5,995,017) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Perotto '319 (US Patent No. 5,050,319).

With respect to Claims 11 and 16, Foffano teaches a method of making a part of a sports boot as previously described.

Foffano does not expressly teach that one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold, specifically a protecting tongue.

Perotto teaches attaching a tongue to an inner lining (one of the materials has an element affixed to it before it is placed in the injection mold; wherein the affixed element is a protecting tongue) (see Claim 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Perotto '319's tongue with Foffano's method of making a shoe in order to have a tongue that spread the clamping pressure exerted by the buckles of the boot on the instep and on the anterior part of the bottom of the leg at least to the point that it does not exert painful pressure on the tibia (see Perotto '319 col. 1, lines 14-23 and col. 3, lines 3-17).

With respect to Claim 19, the tongue provides closure on the front of the shoe part. Thus the shoe is a compartment enclosed by the affixed element. This

Art Unit: 1732

compartment is able to be used to contain the foot or injected personalization material such as bronze for shoe bronzing. As no step of injecting a personalization material is positively claimed and because the shoe is able to fulfill this function as previously described above, the limitations of the claim are met.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 04 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

1) Smith's teaching of "felts made from other fibers" (see Smith, *Textiles in Perspective*, page 418) is broad enough to include fibers other than natural fibers such as polyester.

2) Collier teaches that thermoplastic fibers can be used to make nonwoven fabrics (Collier, *Understanding Textiles*, page 359), and thermoplastic fibers include polyester fibers.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC §103, second paragraph, rejection. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

3) With respect to Claim 1, Foffano does not teach

a) composite material or flat elements.

b) the steps of preparing a first blank intended to form the external face and a second blank intended to form the internal face of the boot part.

c) placing the first and second blanks on the impression of a first half of a mold with the first blank against the impression and closing the mold by using its second half.

d) injection molding a foamable binding material between the first and second blanks to give the boot part its final three-dimensional shape.

e) the composite material of the instant invention. Instead, it teaches a composite of a first and second flexible material and a foamable binding material.

4) Molding a resting surface of a sole as disclosed by Foffano and the upper in Foffano are not comparable to the instant invention.

5) The sole of Foffano comprises a perimetric ridge and is bonded to an upper, which does not teach or disclose the details of the formation of the upper as recited in Claim 1 because the upper in Foffano already has a three dimensional shape.

6) Claim 22 claims a boot part that is in its final three-dimensional shape, which is different from Foffano in that Foffano's components are two three-dimensional components, which neither change shape in the process.

The Applicant's arguments are addressed as follows:

1) Smith's teaching that "true felts are made of wool, hair, and fur fibers" (see Smith, *Textiles in Perspective*, page 418) means that other felts are not true felts. Thus, it is unclear what polyester felt is if it is not truly a felt.

1) Moreover, in view of Applicant's discussion of polyester felt and true felts in Applicant's Arguments filed 05 December 2006, page 8, first complete paragraph, if Applicant's argument is that polyester felt is not a true felt, then it is not clear:

Art Unit: 1732

- which parts of the term "felt" are applicable to the claimed term "polyester felt," and
- how similar the scope of the term "felt" is to the scope of the term "polyester felt."

2) Collier's teaching of making nonwovens of thermoplastic fibers appears to be directed only to the broad genus of nonwoven fabrics, particularly given that the discussion is within the Nonwoven Fabrics section (Collier, *Understanding Textiles*, page 359) rather than the felt species of the nonwoven genus. In deciding the clarity of the term "polyester felt," a discussion of polyester nonwoven is moot.

3) Foffano's connected sole 4 and upper 2 are connected by a foam 3 (claims 1 and 5; col. 2, lines 64-66). Thus, the connected structure is a composite material.

3a) Foffano's sole 4 is a flat element (see Fig. 1) as is the upper 2 to the extent that the upper is flat is an area that foam is applied (see Fig. 5 and 6) and to the extent that it is a flat material wrapped around a last 13 (see Fig. 1).

3b) Concerning the intentions of the united elements, Foffano's the final structure (see fig. 12) shows that the resting surface of a sole from rubber (first blank in a first flexible material) forms an external face downward with respect to fig. 12. The upper (a second blank of a second flexible material) forms an internal face in that the upper parts of the sides form an internal face with respect to where a foot would insert.

3c) Foffano's sole (first blank) and upper (a second blank) are on the first half of the mold 8 and 13, respectively, with the sole (first blank) against the impression 8 of the first half of the mold 13 and 8 (see fig. 3 and 4). Foffano's second half of the mold

Art Unit: 1732

11b and 11a are used to close the mold (closing the mold by using the second half)  
(See fig. 3 and 4).

3d) Foffano injects polyurethane between the two layers (injecting a foamable binding material between the blanks) (see col. 3, line 32; claim 5).

3d) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention as claimed in Claim 1, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., giving the boot part its final three-dimensional shape) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3e and 4) Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

5) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention as claimed in Claim 1, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the first blank cannot have a three-dimensional portion) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5) In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "from flat elements" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A



Art Unit: 1732

preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Specifically, since the blanks are not claimed as being manipulated while flat or provided as flat, the Examiner considers the limitation "from flat elements" to only be provided rather than including the steps of manipulating or providing flat blanks.

5) Moreover, the upper 2 (a second blank) of Foffano is flat to the extent that it requires the reinforcement of the last 13.

6) Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection of Claim 22.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1732

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Butler whose telephone number is (571) 272-8517. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo.-Th. 7:30 a.m. - 5 p.m. and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Patrick Butler  
Assistant Examiner  
Art Unit 1732



CHRISTINA JOHNSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

3/2/07